

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated March 27, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-7, 13, 15-17, 19, 21-23, 27, 29-31, 33, 37-43, and 45-63 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5, 15-17, 19, 21, 22, 29, 30, 45, 47-54 and 59-63 are allowed and the allowance is gratefully acknowledged by Applicants. Claims 4-7, 13, 23, 27, 31, 33, 37-43, 46 and 55-58 stand rejected. No claims are amended and no claims are added. Claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 23, 27, 31, 33, 37-43, 46 and 55-58 are canceled, without prejudice. As a result claims 1-3, 5, 15-17, 19, 21, 22, 29, 30, 45, 47-54 and 59-63 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 30 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of dependent claims constitutes a recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on Applicants' Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or a subsequent application.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 23, 27, 55 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner contended that the claims contain subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or to which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The Examiner contends that the first and second conductive elements recited in claim 23, "being in physical proximity to each other, without further shielding element disclosed (figure 3) form an approximation to a transmission line with respect to each other. Because of this, a signal applied to one of the conductors will also drive the second conductor." The Examiner rejected claims 31, 33, 37-43, 46, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Macke, Sr. et al. (U.S. 6,137,282) in view of Blaine (U.S. 6,023,970).

Applicants disagree and traverse the rejections. However, in light of the allowable subject matter, Applicants cancel claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 23, 27, 31, 33, 37-43, 46 and 55-58, without prejudice. Accordingly, allowed claims 1-3, 5, 15-17, 19, 21, 22, 29, 30, 45, 47-54 and 59-63 remain in the application. Applicants respectfully request that the amendment canceling claims

4, 6, 7, 13, 23, 27, 31, 33, 37-43, 46 and 55-58 be entered as placing the application in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants believe all of the claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 25, 2007

Customer No: 25181

Patent Group

Foley Hoag, LLP

155 Seaport Blvd.

Boston, MA 02210-2600

/ Robert W. Gauthier /

Robert W. Gauthier, Reg. No. 35,153

Attorney for Applicants

Tel. No. (617) 832-1175

Fax. No. (617) 832-7000